



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

lized state, they can readily be persuaded to sell for the benefit of *bona fide* white settlers. Thus the two laws can be made to work in unity. It is so in most other cases, not excluding those which come within international relations. Back of the specious philosophy which urges the other course will be found, in almost every instance, the lurking hand of selfish greed. This selfishness which would leap moral boundaries to gratify its desires, is not strength, after all, but weakness. The decay of nations begins when they habitually turn a deaf ear to the teachings of the ethical law, and a willing one to the delusive whisperings of greed and power.

HERBERT WELSH.

PHILADELPHIA.

"LADIES AND GENTLEMEN."

1. The occasion of these remarks was a correspondence in the *Daily Chronicle* a few months back. I refer to it only from memory, and I believe that it contained some good letters; but taken as a whole, it impressed me painfully. I thought that there was little if any attempt to go below the purely conventional point of view, and to ask what these symbols—the terms Lady and Gentleman—really mean, and whether or no they carry a tradition of value to mankind.

The discussion appeared to me to go off into considerations about the ratio between the cubic content of the front hall in a man's house, and his gentlemanly qualities. It is a kind of calculation in which I have no skill.

According to my recollection, no one definitely asked the question: "Is there anything, precious to humanity, represented by these titles; and if so, what is it?"

I believe in Ladies and Gentlemen, and this ignoring the point at issue seemed to me very sad.

2. There is a difficulty or paradox threatening every approach to this subject; and in a blundering way even that correspondence showed it to have been felt.

It springs, perhaps, from the very ardor of our Christianity,

our democratic spirit, and our Teutonic gospel of work. We have learned to say, What *really matters* in human nature is—goodness, perhaps, or ability, or “backbone”; all that we call “character.” And having said this, we really do not know where to put certain other human qualities; we have, in our rough working theory, simply no place left for them.

And so we get our puzzle. The man who has the root of the matter in him (say, in religion, character, courage, disinterestedness,) is any man’s equal. “A man’s a man for a’ that.” “The honest man’s the noblest work of God.” Nothing can be better than the best, and a strong inner life, or a great definite achievement, a great mind or heart or will, *is* the best. To be Lady or Gentleman adds nothing. How can any qualities add anything to the best?

And yet, “the quality”—what a significant phrase—is valued. There is something in it which appeals to man wherever he is civilized in any degree worth mentioning. The very efforts made to explain it away are proofs of it. “Nature’s gentlemen,” “true” ladies and gentlemen, we are told, may be found in any rank or country. Very likely; but the suggestion shows that they have a quality which is valued, and which is not possessed by all.

Thus we are in a contradiction; and because in a contradiction we are also in an uneasy sensitive frame of mind. We admit that the quality exists—the quality of being a lady or gentleman—and we show in practice that we value it. But still not really knowing what to make of it we turn round and disparage it, and grumble that the distinction indicated has no real basis, and would be better away.

We want some intelligible account of the relation of these qualities to the recognized sterling attributes of human character.

3. Let us take some examples of defect in these qualities, from which we may form a rough judgment of their nature. And for our purpose, we may omit what in some respects is the most important case. That is to say, we need not give examples of acknowledged badness of mind or character making people unladylike or ungentlemanlike. They would give

us too much for our purpose. Our puzzle is, in brief, the question what is added to a *good* man or woman by being a gentleman or lady. In the case of a bad man or woman the basis of excellence is lacking, and the absence of the superstructure is no paradox. The paradox would be if it were present; if bad people could be real ladies and gentlemen. Something like this can happen; and we will say a brief word on it below.

But our examples, to solve our main paradox, must show us the difference, the addendum by which one who has sterling worth, and is a lady or gentleman, excels one who has sterling worth and is not. If a thoroughly good man or woman can fail in these qualities, what do they lose by it? What does humanity lose by it?

We begin from the outside, with examples which may perhaps be thought wholly irrelevant, and work inwards to mind and character.

I. Some of us need not go far to find a man who cannot raise his hat to a lady while he is riding a bicycle. Here we have a little failure in a matter of bodily training, and consequently a little failure to be equal to a certain trivial situation. Take another trivial case. It is noticeable nowadays, that in traveling by rail, especially in cold weather, a man who has lowered the carriage window to let himself out will usually replace it before closing the door. This is one of the little democratic courtesies which we learn in the train and the omnibus, and which it is so pleasant to see making progress amongst us. But to replace the window when the door is open, and often with only one hand free, is just a little difficult, and one envies the people who can jerk it into place with a motion of their left hand. If you fumble with it, the little act of courtesy is spoilt; the people for whom it is being done are more put out than if you had let it alone. There are many other little instances where bodily skill makes life easier; a whole tableful of people may be disconcerted because you cannot carve properly at dinner. From these cases we naturally pass to dancing and athletic exercises, riding, skating, rowing. Without suggesting that it is a serious duty for every one to be good at all

these things, we see quite plainly that each one of them is a means of being equal to a certain set of situations, in other words, of being pleasant and serviceable in certain ways and on certain occasions. An old gentleman in a novel by Wilkie Collins says that when he was young, people were expected to bring social qualities with them on social occasions, and now, as he sees that a croquet mallet and ball are the social qualities in demand, he will not fail to employ them. Some people, who detest croquet, may feel a little rebuked by this old gentleman.

In short, as we have been told that all Fine Art is athletic, it would seem that the same is true of some qualities of the lady or gentleman. This was a Greek and mediæval idea, an idea powerful among ourselves almost down to the last generation, and probably, *mutatis mutandis*, it ought not to be lost.

II. Let us turn to another set of defects, still half bodily, and, as I think, highly suggestive for our subject; defects in expression by language. The simplest and typical case is being in a foreign country, and either unable, or very imperfectly able, to speak the language. Under such conditions one is apt to feel oneself simply a brute beast; one cannot explain, nor apologize, nor thank any one for a courtesy. If conversation is attempted, the sentences are certain to be awkward and abrupt, and very likely take a shape which, according to the idiom of the country, is imperative or rude. I remember a German who had really assisted me in explaining my ticket coupon to the guard of the train, saying to me when the explanation was ended, "You can retain your seat." To an English ear the form of that sentence implies a permission which might have been refused; and as I was in the right throughout, I was half annoyed, though in fact the speaker had rendered me a great service. Or again, when we made use of the club hut on a hill in Norway, and some Norwegians, apparently club members, were there, we could not say a word of thanks for the courtesy by which English travelers were allowed to lunch in the room. The Norwegians, indeed, were cleverer than we, for as there was a schoolboy in our party, and also one in theirs, they sent their schoolboy to ours to offer him a piece of cake, a pleasant courtesy, which we had no way

of returning. Here, too, is a comic incident, with a serious side. A friend of mine, bold, but not strong, in the French language, was staying somewhere in Brittany, and at table d'hôte the conversation turned on French and English bathing fashions. My friend did his best to explain that in England we do not commonly wear costumes, but that men and women have separate bathing places. An elderly Frenchman regarded him with a horrified gaze, and then turned to his own party and reported to them in French that the Englishman had just told him how in England bathers do not wear costumes, and the men and women have the same bathing place. My friend was at the end of his French, and was forced to let the impression remain. This is bad enough, but in even more serious matters what an impression of brutality such a misunderstanding might produce! It seems hardly too much to say that if we really knew each other's language half the international complications would disappear. The same is obviously true, in the most literal as well as the most metaphorical sense, of intercourse between different classes, professions, political parties and other distinct elements within the same country. Offence, given and taken, depends very largely upon defects of language.

III. Following the same clue we may now come closer to intelligence and will. In passing, we should once more note the instance of games, speaking now of those which demand some little attention and mental effort, but are in no way athletic. The principle is the same as before. For want of a modicum of skill and practice, in the present case not involving any special bodily gifts, we are unable to be pleasant and useful in certain ways. We may have good reason for the line we take, but the fact remains. One has heard a saying, "If the Queen asked you to play whist with her, and you could not, you would have to be a great philosopher not to feel a fool." Or we may put it more strongly by saying, "If any old person or invalid desired you to play with him——." Then we come to a set of defects almost affecting morality and intelligence, but yet on the whole compatible with "sterling worth." Of these is slowness in recognizing people whom you meet, owing

frequently to pre-occupation or again to what may be called student's paralysis—the tendency to hesitate too long when some simple thing is to be done suddenly. This may of course give most serious annoyance absolutely without intention. The same result may be produced by strictly physical drawbacks—short sight for example. It has been said of Lord Sherbrooke (Mr. Lowe) that he simply could not see to find the people by talking to whom he might have made friends and become more popular than he was; so that a wholly false impression of him became current. Shyness, impatience, the flurry which prevents one from attending to others, may all be pretty much of this type, and are quite compatible with real readiness to do service. A very young and nervous lecturer, having been conscious of a bustle in the middle of his lecture, observed afterwards to a friend that he feared people had found him dull and gone out. On being answered that Miss X. had fainted from the heat, he exclaimed cheerfully, "Oh, that is all right then." "Except for Miss X.," his friend replied. But the lecturer was not a bad man. There is one opportunity which I should very much like to have over again. After lecturing at Plymouth, in New England, I was going down to the station on my way West, when a gentleman who had been among my audience met me and offered me some flowers. They were some specimens of the *Sabbatia* which is a striking feature of the wet woods near Plymouth, and which would have been a pleasant memorial of the place. But I was fretted about my journey, and was carrying, I suppose, my bag and coat, and had, or thought I had, no hand to spare for the flowers, and declined to take them with me. It was not bad intention; it was quite unnecessary flurry. My action, however, distresses me when I recall it.

Closely akin to these is lack of conversation, a more inward phase corresponding to ignorance of another's language. It is a good old ideal that a gentleman should be able to talk properly to any one. Inability to do so is bad in any case, but worst of all as a class barrier. It may be urged that this is a symptom of a deeper want and not in itself a cause. But that is only half true. Even if you argue that learning to talk

means acquiring sympathy and intelligence which you had not before, still it is the case that they can be acquired in this way; but, really, to say that unexpressed sympathy is non-existent is pressing a good idea too far. You may have a true sympathy and understanding, and yet, from comparatively minor causes, fail to give it effect. This inarticulateness is like not knowing the language; and like it, makes you *pro tanto* inhuman.

Another defect closely connected with this is "saying the wrong thing." It is the greatest of errors to suppose that the first thing a man blurts out is what he really meant to say. To say what we mean needs training. What Ruskin says of telling truth applies to it. "Telling truth is like writing fair; it comes only by practice."

Always excluding malicious intention, we may treat inconsiderateness from this same point of view. It means want of facility in picking up a new context. The persons we meet are more or less "unseen pieces" whom we have to construe. If we have no gift or no practice, we construe them all wrong; we fail, that is, to piece together their real thought and wish out of the acts and words which we have to go by.

All these latter and more intimate defects might be brought under the general heading of want of presence of mind. We are supposing that the man or woman has sterling worth; but there is, so to speak, an "uncultivated" margin all round his centre of thought and conduct. It is a margin which his mind has never thoroughly "cultivated"; has never worked over or been worked into, and therefore is not readily present in.

Of course there are people who have a quality which is an opposite of this, and yet is also a defect—the defect of "having all their money in small change," of being equal to small and every-day situations, and to no others. There is no difficulty of principle in this fact. All defects have false opposites which are as much defects as themselves. That is why people are half proud of certain faults; because they seem opposed to faults which are even worse. All sound characters, then, have their caricatures—the false opposites of those faults to which the sound characters are the true opposites. We are looking

for the nature of the sound character, and the existence of the caricature does not trouble us.

IV. We are now ready to throw out one or two suggestions for a conclusion. If we review these groups of examples, they all seem to be obstructions or impediments; failures, by reason of external or comparatively external incompetence, to express or display the intelligence or good-will that we really have. Either the body, or the mind in some special phase of activity—and we have plainly seen that these two regions are continuous—has not been successfully made instrumental to working out the great ends of life in details, in the sphere of little things or of daily routine.

But these terms “obstructions” or “impediments” are metaphors, and in this reference are a little dangerous. They favor unduly the popular view from which we started. They suggest the notion of “sterling worth” which is really and completely there, but somehow screened off, like the sun behind a cloud.

But we should bear in mind what the “obstruction” in these cases really means. It is this, that a certain margin of positive work, of the same kind as all moral growth and will-formation, has been left undone. Morality, we know, is a *second* nature. All that is good and human in us means that a work has been accomplished; mind and body have been disciplined impulses have been harmonized, the power of intelligence has asserted itself, right through and in our habits of thought and action. At the beginning of our development we are not a moral self, perhaps not a self at all. The self, certainly at least the moral self, is not born but made. Obstruction of the kind we have indicated, means that this work has been left imperfect.

Thus it is only a first approximation to say in the ordinary sense of the words, that the qualities of ladies and gentlemen are *expressions* of humanity and goodness, and the defect of them is a mere obstruction, a cloud which prevents us from seeing a humanity and goodness which are really there. If we say this, we have to remember that expression gives perfection and existence to what it expresses, and if there were no ex-

pression there could be nothing to express. The "obstruction" in these cases does not leave the soul and its qualities intact behind it like a fire behind a screen. It means that the process of making the soul actual, of making the man or woman, has never been completed. A quality may be real, though unexpressed in minor ways, if it is expressed in great ones. But for all that it is the less real in as far as it is not expressed.

The idea that goodness or sterling worth is somehow and in some way real, when it seems not to be actual at all, is sometimes a very touching self-deception. We remember Dickens' Joe Gargery, whose father was simply a ruffian, and who always ended any allusion to him by saying, "But my father were that good in his 'art, don't you see."

On a first reading of Aristotle's *Ethics* we are apt to complain that the excellences of social intercourse—agreeableness true modesty, and wit or the power of saying the right thing, ought hardly to be prominent in a serious treatise on moral qualities. But on further consideration we see how thorough and effective is the Greek moral idea of a life that embodies the right ratio in every situation—the beautiful life. We certainly need to bear it in mind in correction of the more modern ideal of "sterling worth."

Thus I am led to suggest a simple account of the difference between the "quality" of lady and gentleman, and those solid endowments of intellect, heart, or character, which we have learned chiefly to value to-day. It is a question of nothing other than the degree in which intelligence and good-will have found expression in the detailed behavior of body and of mind. *In this sense* we may fearlessly say that a lady is higher than a mere woman, and a gentleman than a mere man. For, other things being equal, the lady is more of a woman, and the gentleman more of a man. Humanity is in them more thoroughly achieved; something is perfected in them which is present, but not perfected, in the others. The human nature, which is a rough sketch in the one, is a finished work in the other. We may say if we like that to be a lady or a gentleman is only an expression or manifestation of "sterling worth," but, in saying it, we have to bear in mind that expression, if not the whole

of the reality, is at least something apart from which there is no reality at all.

V. Finally, we must say a word on the troublesome subject of the current usage of these terms in designating social classes.

I am not in the very least degree frightened on behalf of my theory by the existence of sham ladies and gentlemen. No marked type, I should imagine, can exist without giving rise to its caricature. It is as in bad art—the expression of a genuine meaning can in some degree be imitated by a trick, and you can have a thing that looks clever or attractive, and yet has no idea in it, or a bad one. To some extent we are all of us continually playing a trick like this. In trying to be like what we admire we hit off the emphasis wrongly, and reproduce less of its merits than of its defects. The point is too obvious to press, but it is sufficient to account for any quantity of false pretension to qualities which have something admirable in them. And then we may admit that all have defects, and the possession of the qualities is a matter of degree—and of direction. This latter point is highly illustrative of our principle, and the facts seem to me unquestionable, though much everyday prejudice contradicts them. A man who is a gentleman in one direction in one section of his mind, so to speak, often, if not always fails to be so in another. And, as a rule, he is a gentleman in what he understands, and less so, or not at all, in what he is ignorant of. I believe it to be merely prejudice which affirms that knowledge and experience generate an overbearing temper. A man who is accustomed to be heard with respect on one subject is often overbearing when he meets with opposition on some other matter, but not, I think, as a rule, in dealing with the matter which he has made his own. It must have struck others besides myself that men unaccustomed to writing seem sometimes to lose all self-restraint when they put pen to paper and though good enough gentlemen in private life, seem not to know how to behave in the republic of letters. They never were there before, and they do not know the traditions and conventions of the place. So a soldier will become violent in a political discussion, but yet will treat a difference of opinion on a point of military technique with candor and with respect

for the views of others. We have long ago condemned the doctrine that virtue is knowledge; but this is partly because it has depths of meaning which we have never sounded.

But all this makes no difference to the important question which is, not whether there is much of the false and much failure in the world; but whether there is enough of the true to be recognizable, in the intention which on the whole governs the application of the words *Lady* and *Gentleman*.

There is one difficulty in asserting this, on the principle above suggested, which seems to me serious though not fatal. It may be said: "Well, grant that these terms are meant to mean the completest expression of humanity. You will judge, I suppose, where this is to be found, by considering who in fact can be said to make their humanity effectually felt; who are at home and at ease with the greatest number and variety of mankind. And these, surely, are the poor and the manual workers. They are at their ease, comfortable and kindly with a far larger part of mankind than "*Ladies and Gentlemen*" in the usual sense. On your principle, the application of the term should be reversed, and the qualities usually indicated by them should be condemned as a ground of exclusiveness."

I believe the fact alleged by the supposed objector to be true, and it seems to me very important, and not, as a rule, sufficiently considered. We have to think not merely of the kindness of the poor to one another, but of the free-masonry of the poor and the manual workers generally with one another, both with those of their own country and to a great extent with foreigners. The very definite and direct common experience of work, hardship and simple pleasures, seems to give them a power of being easily at home with one another. It is needless to enlarge on this. I take it to be unquestioned that, unless some special cause of quarrel exists, a workman will be welcomed by others, treated as a friend, and shown what courtesy and hospitality is in their power, pretty nearly all the world over. Of course in laying stress upon this point, I do not mean that this is all that could be said if our object were to form an estimate of their social qualities throughout. But this is the one point in which it might be urged that their life is on

an absolutely different footing from that of the more leisured classes. "C'est le peuple qui compose le genre humain," and to be in touch with the people, it may be said, is to have mastered the full expression of humanity.

Still, we must never judge by numbers in a question of completeness. We must consider how far the possibilities of human nature, as experience vouches for them, are realized. And it seems clear that what forms the strength of the life of manual workers is also, for our present purpose, its weakness; that is the simplicity of its situations. For this has the result of leaving, as a rule, a great part of human nature in them "uncultivated." We have found that the defects which we passed in review amounted pretty much to forms of inarticulateness; and inarticulateness* is a leading characteristic of manual workers. The frightful language which some of them habitually use, means, I take it, merely this; they feel emphatic about something, and the accustomed epithet presents itself because truer modes of emphasis are not at command. Ultra refinement here joins hands with its opposite. The use of "jolly" in University talk seems a counterpart, for inarticulateness, to the costermonger's most deeply tinted epithet. And the best workmen would themselves, I think, deplore as a misfortune incident to the simplicity of their training what might be called the passive form of inarticulateness, inability to meet a new point of view or another person's position with sympathetic appreciation. The power to respond in this way is a thing which I believe they are eager to acquire, but no one who observes them in controversy can think that they have attained it.

I have ascribed certain limitations to the hardness and simplicity of the workman's life. But before concluding this article I should like to refer to an utterance which shows the immense importance of training and family tradition quite apart from differences of income. It is contained in the views ex-

* It is very striking that workmen, especially in the country, will often show an articulateness in their work, which they are trained in, entirely beyond anything they can express in speech, which they are not trained in. They will execute carefully and precisely a piece of work, which you can't feel at all assured that they have understood when you talk it over beforehand.

pressed by the late T. H. Green in consequence of his work as an assistant commissioner of the Endowed Schools Commission of 1864. He found at that time in the course of his very careful personal investigation, a most remarkable difference between the start in school life obtained by children of the professional and those of the commercial class, owing entirely to the difference of educational standard between the two classes. This difference need not in the least coincide with a difference of income. It depends on the love of culture, and the habit of using books, and speaking English correctly, and the recognition of knowledge as something worth having. It is to be hoped that things are not now as they were thirty years ago. The Board Schools are changing many things, and this perhaps among them. But if it were true that between any two contiguous social strata there was a difference of this kind, or in as far as there is such a difference, man's natural respect for complete humanity will probably insist on marking it by the use of the terms which we are discussing.

Thus I suggest that the qualities pointed out by the words Lady and Gentleman *are* precious to humanity; they are its completion by effective utterance; and, roughly speaking, social usage intends to teach us to look for them in dispositions formed by careful and high-minded education, within families or schools where it has been an object to train the bodily and mental habits to be in detail the efficient expression of human nature at its best.

B. BOSANQUET.

LONDON.